

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the application; Claims 1-12 are amended; and Claims 13-16 are added by the present amendment. Claims 1-4 have been amended to avoid interpretation under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 6th paragraph, and Claims 1-12 have been amended to more clearly recite that which is claimed and to correct cosmetic matters of form. New Claim 16 recites substantially similar subject matter to amended Claim 5, but has been written to elicit interpretation under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 6th paragraph. Support for new Claims 13-15 can be found in the original specification, claims and figures.¹ Thus, no new matter is presented.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Abstract was objected to for being too long; Claims 1, 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hanai et al. (EP 0640897, hereinafter "Hanai"); Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hanai in view of Baik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,668,915, hereinafter "Baik"); and Claims 3, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hanai in view of Baik and in further view of Nishigaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,365, hereinafter "Nishigaki").

In response to the objection to the Abstract, a replacement Abstract has been provided which conforms to the guidelines set forth in M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b). Specifically, it has been rewritten to exclude any legal phraseology and to be of proper length. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection based on Hanai, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

¹ Specification at Figure 12, and page 3, lines 1-10.

Generally, the present application describes a method and system for correcting data provided by a real-time-clock (RTC) in an information processing device using information retrieved from a broadcast signal. A memory is provided which stores the details of each correction procedure or attempted correction procedure, and this stored information can be used by the user to adjust a recording start or end time or to adjust the time settings.² The stored correction information can also be used to adjust the time information provided by a RTC in the absence of a received broadcast signal including time synchronization information.³

Amended Claim 1 relates to an information processing apparatus including a clock configured to supply time information used to manage an operation of the image processing apparatus, and a receiver configured to control a reception of a broadcast signal. A detection unit is also provided which is configured to detect predetermined information from the broadcast signal received by the receiver with a predetermined period of time based on the time information supplied by the clock. A processor is also provided which corrects time information supplied by the clock based on the results of the detection of the predetermined information by the detection unit. The result of this correction of time information is then stored in a memory.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

“... a memory configured to record a result of the correction of the time information performed by the processor.”

Hanai describes a broadcast signal receiver including an internal clock for controlling an internal (20) or external (12) tuner which receives a plurality of broadcast signals. The internal clock causes the tuner to into a predetermined broadcast signal which includes time

² Specification at Figures 5, 12 and 14.

³ Specification at Figure 17.

data indicating a local time. Time data is extracted (22) from the output signal and the internal clock of the broadcast signal receiver is automatically set to a local time indicated by the time data.⁴ Hanai describes the time information is detected in a received broadcast signal and that this time information is used to set the local time of the internal clock of the receiver.⁵ However, Hanai fails to teach or disclose recording the result of the time correction, or a device configured to store the results of the correction.

Amended Claim 1 recites a memory configured to record a result of the correction of the time information performed by the processor. As discussed above, Hanai describes that local time data is retrieved from a received broadcast signal and that a local clock of the receiving device is set to the time detected in the broadcast signal.⁶ Therefore, Hanai describes that the clock is adjusted based on this received signal, however Hanai fails to teach or disclose storing a result of this time correction. Further, Hanai fails to describe a memory configured to record a result of a correction of time information, and instead simply describes that the tuner's clock is adjusted in real-time based on the timing information received in the broadcast signal. Therefore, Hanai fails to teach or disclose a memory configured to record the results of the correction of the time information performed by the processor, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons given with respect to amended Claim 1, it is also submitted that amended independent Claims 5, 9, and 16 also patentably define over Hanai.

As discussed above, Hanai, fails to teach or disclose recording a result of the correction of time information whatsoever. Likewise, neither Baik nor Nishigaki remedy this deficiency, and therefore, neither Baik nor Nishigaki, alone or in combination with Hanai

⁴ Hanai at Abstract.

⁵ Hanai at Col. 7, lines 1-12 and lines 45-60.

⁶ Id.

disclose or suggest Applicants' Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-15 which include the above distinguished limitation by virtue of dependency. Therefore, the Official Action has not provided *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to any of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-16 as patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL/ATH/law
I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\20's\202552-US\202552US-AM.DOC